## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical errors. Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 23 and have cancelled Claims 3 and 14. No new matter was added by these amendments. Claims 1, 2, 4-13 and 15-24 remain in the application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

unpatentable over Phillips (USPN 6,765,536). Applicants traverse these rejections. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the language of "wherein the conducting element and the parasitic conductor extend from the conducting base at a single corner region of the conducting base; and an insulating substrate, wherein the conducting element and the parasitic conductor are provided on opposite surfaces of the insulating substrate." Applicants submit that Phillips fails to render Claims 1 and 2 obvious because it fails to teach or suggest the above-underlined limitations that were added to Claim 1 and are included by dependency in Claim 2. The language added to Claim 1 comes from cancelled Claims 3 and 14, which the Examiner has acknowledged is not taught or suggested in Phillips.

For these reasons, Applicants submit that Claims 1 and 2 are now in a condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Holshouser (USPN 6,107,970).

Applicants traverse these rejections. Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 23 to include the language of "wherein the conducting element and the parasitic conductor extend from the conducting base at a single corner region of the conducting base; and an insulating substrate, wherein the conducting element and the parasitic conductor are provided on opposite surfaces of the insulating substrate." Applicants submit that the combined teachings of Phillips and Holshouser fails to render Claims 3-24 obvious because they fail to teach or suggest the above-underlined limitations that were added to Claims 1 and 23 and are included by dependency in Claims 4-13, 15-22 and 24.

TO: USPTO

More specifically, as argued above the Examiner has acknowledged that Phillips fails to teach these limitations but argues that Holshouser does. Applicants disagree. The Examiner points to figures 7A and 7B as illustrating a substrate (40) wherein the conducting element (helical antenna 46b) and the parasitic conductor (parasitic element 44) are provided on opposite surfaces of the insulating substrate. Assuming arguendo that this is true, Holshouser does not further teach or suggest that the conducting element (helical antenna 46b) and the parasitic conductor (parasitic element 44) extend from the conducting base at a single corner region of the conducting base as recited in Claims 1 and 23 and included by dependency in Claims 4-13, 15-22 and 24.

For these reasons, Applicants submit that Claim 4-13 and 15-23 are now in a condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless the Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants believe that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants. In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502117.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc. Law Department

Customer Number: 22917

Respectfully submitted

Valerie M. Davis Attorney of Record Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone:847.576.6733 Fax No.: 847.576.0721